

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 29, 2006 requires Applicant to elect one of three identified groups of claims (i.e., Groups I, II or III). The Applicant hereby elects Group III, which includes claims 18-27 and 35-42. However, this election is made with traverse for the following reasons.

M.P.E.P. § 803 states that an application may be properly restricted to one or more claimed inventions only if (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Thus, even if appropriate reasons exist for requiring restriction, such a requirement should not be made unless there is an undue burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in a single application. It would seem that the searches involved for all three claim groups would substantially overlap. For example, both claim 8 (in Group I) and claim 35 (in Group III) generally relate to template processing, presumably requiring a substantially common focus of search for both claims. This is merely one example that supports the general conclusion that the searches involved for all three claim groups would substantially overlap, thus making restriction improper under M.P.E.P. § 803.


For at least the above-identified reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests removal of the Restriction Requirement and examination of all of the pending claims, i.e., claims 1-42.

1 The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned if any issues remain unresolved
2 by this Response.
3
4

5 Respectfully Submitted,

6
7 Dated: October 30, 2006

8 By:

9 
10 David M. Huntley
11 Reg. No. 40,309
12 (509) 324-9256
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25